STP Active Program Management:

Revised Policy Framework for STP PSC Discussion

May 23, 2018

Today's goals

- Review revised policy framework
- Discuss next steps in policy development

Review: Initial Staff Proposal

- Proposal applies to Local Programs (Councils and CDOT) and the Shared Fund
- Four components:
 - Program Development
 - Project Management
 - Program Management
 - Additional Provisions

Proposal: Program Development *No revisions*

- Calls for Projects
- Active Programs
- Contingency Programs

Proposal: Project Management *No revisions*

- Training
- Designated Project Managers
- Quarterly Status Updates

Revised Proposal: Program Management

- Obligation Deadlines Revised: Project phase extensions; Limited extension of unused programming authority
 - Goal is to obligate 100% of mark by end of FFY (9/30)
 - Flexibility to reprogram to accomplish goal
 - Revised: Project Phase Extensions
 - New: Limited extension of unused programming authority
- Active Reprogramming
 No revisions: Clarifications/Samples
- Carryover Limitations and Redistribution of Unobligated Funding New: Access to redistributed funds

Revised Proposal: Obligation Deadlines Project Phase Extensions

- Revised: Phase 1 or Phase 2 Engineering or Right of Way: 6 months (to Mar 31)
- Construction: 6 months
 (to the pre-final submittal date associated with the April state letting)
- Must request by TBD date in April
- Selecting body staff decides, based on ability to meet extended deadline
- If request denied, can appeal to selecting body or choose other options
- If approved, programmed funds can be carried over (subject to limits)

Revised Proposal: Obligation Deadlines Project Phase Extensions, cont'd

- Extension granted to individual project phase
- Each phase can only be granted one extension
- Can actively reprogram (replace with a different project/phase) an extended project phase
 - No future extensions for the reprogrammed project phase or replacement project phase
 - Replacement project phase must meet deadlines of project phase it replaced

If not obligated by extended deadline:

- All project phases moved to contingency program (and must reapply next call if not advanced)
- Funds carried over with phase are withdrawn from local program and redistributed to Shared Fund
- Project phase will not be eligible to access Shared Fund to move forward or receive cost increases



Proposal: Active Reprogramming Examples – delayed project phases

Date	Status	Notes
10/1/2020	Phase 1 started in September, no significant env. impacts anticipated – DA expected 3/1/2021	Phase 2 programmed in FFY 21; CON in FFY 22
11/15/2020	Discovered soils tests will be needed, but can't be completed until the ground thaws in the spring – revised DA date 8/1/2021	Phase 2 should be reprogrammed in FFY 22 (and CON in FFY 23) to avoid missing deadlines

Date	Status	Notes
10/1/2021	Phase 2 in progress – target letting April 2022, pending ROW clearance	CON programmed in FFY 22
3/30/2022	ROW not certified due to one parcel going to condemnation proceedings – new target letting June 2022	No program changes
4/30/2022	December 2021 court date set, but sponsor will continue efforts to settle out of court.	Three options: Reprogram CON in FFY23 Move CON to Contingency until ROW clears Request an extension (to March 2023)

Proposal: Active Reprogramming Example – funds available

- \$700K is available in the current year. Several ready projects could use funds:
 - Project A: construction bids were \$210K higher than the programmed amount
 - Project B (contingency): received DA and is ready to obligate \$150K for Phase 2 Eng.
 - Project C (contingency): completed QBS and is ready to obligate \$400K for Phase 1 Eng.
- Option: Prioritize funding for the highest ranked projects that fit available funding
 - (\$210 for Project A, \$150 for Project B, unprogrammed: \$330)
- Option: Prioritize active projects over contingency & maximize use of funds
 - (\$210 for Project A, \$400 for Project C, unprogrammed: \$90)
- Option: Maximize number of projects & utilize all available funds
 - (\$150 for Project B, \$400 for Project C, \$150 for Project A, unprogrammed: \$0)

Revised Proposal: Program Management Carryover Limitations & Redistribution of Unobligated Funding

- No more than the annual allotment can be carried over at the end of each FFY
- Revised Carryover can be from:
 - Obligation Remainders
 - Funds programmed for a project(s) granted an extension
 - Unprogrammed funds, under certain circumstances

- Revised Carryover cannot be from:
 - Unprogrammed funds
 - Projects that proceeded at their own risk

- Unobligated funds not carried over will be redistributed to the shared fund
- New! Councils and CDOT will be able to access the shared fund for cost increases and for accelerating ready to obligate phases from both out years and contingency programs

Revised Proposal: Carryover Limitations New! Carryover of Unprogrammed Funds

Council/CDOT unable to actively reprogram in current FFY may carryover funds under these circumstances:

Situation	Caveats
No projects are ready to obligate	The council/CDOT can demonstrate a reasonable expectation for using the carried over funds in the following FFY
Cost of ready to obligate project(s) exceeds balance available	No funds are available from the shared fund to fill the gap $\it and$ the council/CDOT has not accessed the shared fund in the current FFY*

Carryover will only be available for 6 months (to March 31)



^{*}If Council/CDOT used shared funds during the year, the amount of carryover will be reduced in order to "pay back" the shared fund

Revised Proposal: Redistribution of Unob. Funding New! Accessing the Shared Fund for local program projects

Cost increases

- Local current year unprogrammed balance must be used first
- At time of obligation
- After obligation (high bid, change order, engineering supplement)
- Lesser of: 20% of programmed STP or Local Program increase limits
- STP-eligible costs only

Advancing "ready" out year or contingency projects

- Must obligate all local program funds before accessing the shared fund to advance projects
- Extended phases that missed the extended deadline are never eligible to utilize shared funds

Same guidelines for shared fund projects to access redistributed funds

No unprogrammed funds for cost increases and no unobligated funds to advance projects



Revised Proposal: Redistribution of Unob. Funding Prioritizing access to redistributed funds

- "First ready, first funded" or prioritized access?
 - CON phase before ROW, ROW before ENG?
 - Cost increases before advancing projects?
 - Advancing active out years before contingency?
 - Other considerations?

Proposal: Additional Provisions No Revisions

- Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA)
- Qualifications Based Selection (QBS)
- Assistance for Disadvantaged Communities
- Methodology Considerations
 - Points for project readiness/current status
 - Pavement Management System provisions
 - Minimum scoring to receive funding
- Special Provisions for Initial Calls for Projects
 - Grandfathering existing projects

Active Program Management System development timeline

- Selection Committee discussion
 - Jan 2018: issues & options
 - Mar 2018: initial proposal
 - May 2018: revised proposal
 - Sep 2018: Approval
- Discussion of shared fund methodology continues in June
- Summer 2018: council and partner feedback
- Programming cycle begins with call for shared fund projects in Jan 2019 and local program projects in Jan 2020

Summer Feedback

- Combined presentations: APM and Shared Fund
- Draft Shared Fund Program Guidelines/Application Booklet
 - Eligibility and Scoring Criteria
 - Active Program Management Policies
- Draft Active Program Management Guidelines for Local Programs
 - Policies that must be incorporated into local methodologies

Audiences:

- Councils/Council Committees Regular and/or special meetings?
- Regionwide "Workshop"?
- Other stakeholders?





Thank you

Staff Contact:

Kama Dobbs kdobbs@cmap.lllinois.gov 312-386-8710

